

### REMARKS

Claims 12 and 16-18 are rejected as being obvious and unpatentable over Sarnecki, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0089252, (hereafter '252) in view of Towns et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,153,711, (hereafter '711) and Park et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,053,298, (hereafter '298).

The '711 reference to Towns et al. is cited as disclosing an ink for an electroluminescent device with a viscosity range of 1 to 200 cps. However, the premised coating methods of this reference are disclosed as ink-jet printing, spin-coating, blade-coating, etc. as set forth in column 1, lines 32-34 of the patent document. The intaglio printing of the present invention is not premised on the disclosure of the '711 reference. The disclosure of the '711 reference discloses the ink viscosity in printing methods other than the intaglio printing as disclosed and claimed by Applicant, and therefore it is submitted that this reference cannot be maintained as making obvious of the present claimed invention as the optimal ink viscosity range varies in accordance with the printing methods employed and markedly different printing methods are claimed in the present application than those of the '711 reference.

More specifically, it is well known in the art that inks of relatively high viscosity are used in conventional intaglio printing methods rarely, if ever, produce the desired thin film with a uniform thickness that Applicant has discovered, taught and claimed.

This desired result is achieved as the ink viscosity is drastically lower than viscosities usually used intaglio printing. The thin film formation with the further desired result of obtaining a uniform thickness is formed by the wetting and spreading of the ink after coating.

These surprising and desired results are consistently achieved utilizing a low viscosity ink ranging from 0.5 cP or more to 500 cP in intaglio printing methods. This use of these inks in these printing methods was not contemplated or even thought to be achievable by the person skilled in the art. In fact, the use of such low viscosity inks in the claimed printing methods is believed to be contrary to the common beliefs and/or teachings.

The present invention as set forth in the amended claim (amended claim 12) requires that “the depth of a groove or a cell of the intaglio is in a range of 500 Å to 1 mm”. Previous claim 16 (now cancelled) was held to obvious in the ‘252 reference as it was stated in this reference that the desired print thickness can be controlled with gravure printing by controlling the depth of the cells as well as the thickness of the organic light emitting polymers.

It is asserted that the thickness of the coated film and the depth of the cells as disclosed in the ‘252 reference are substantially the same in view of the statement “gravure inks are of intermediate viscosity (paragraph [0011], lines 13-14”. The thickness of the coated film and the depth of the cell of the present invention are not the same due to the fact that the ink wets and spreads after it is coated. The depth of the cell of the present invention does not adversely affect the thickness of the coated film, rather it aids in the wetting and spreading of the ink. Therefore, the depth of the cell of the present invention cannot be elicited from the range of the thickness of the coated film of the ‘252 reference.

The optimal range of the cell depth of the present invention is determined by the wetting and spreading of the ink in accordance with (low) viscosity of the ink employed. The range of the cell depth is in direct relation to the (low) viscosity range of the ink as set forth in the claims.

As previously stated, the low viscosity ink in the claimed range is rarely, if ever, used in intaglio printing as now taught in the subject application. Applicant therefore submits that the claimed method of the present invention cannot be obvious by the combination of the ‘252 reference (disclosing the formation of an electroluminescent device by the intaglio printing) and the ‘711 reference (disclosing ink viscosity ranges for the printing methods other than the claimed intaglio method. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention sets forth and claims features not disclosed or contemplated in either reference alone or in combination provided such combination were permissible under the Law.

Applicant further submits that one of ordinary skill in the art could not discern the requisite elements of the claimed method in view of the disclosures of these two references even

with the benefit of hindsight as the conventional invention at the time of conception of the claimed method taught against the use of the claimed low viscosity ink in the printing methods disclosed and claimed by Applicant.

In conclusion, Applicant request favorable reconsideration of the claimed method as the obviousness rejections raised to the claimed are respectfully submitted to have been overcome.

Date: 10/18/06

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Timothy J. Keefer, Reg. No. 35,567

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP  
131 S. Dearborn Street  
Suite 2400  
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5577  
Telephone: (312) 460-5000  
Facsimile: (312) 460-7000

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Mail Stop: FEE AMENDMENT

Date: October 18, 2006

Deborah E. Dudek  
Deborah E. Dudek